

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/961,218	BROWN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ajay M. Bhatia	2145	

All Participants:

 (1) Ajay M. Bhatia.

 (2) Brian E. Symczak.
Status of Application: Non-Final Rejection

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11 April 2006
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1-21

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


JASON CARDONE
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted applicant's representative of allowable subject matter in claim 6 and 20 in hopes of compact prosecution. Applicant's representative declined the offer of allowable subject matter and insisted those feature were cover by the current claim limitation, examiner clarified that these feature were newly amended to the claims. Also that the feature that applicant's representative discuss is not supported by the current claim limitations, in addition applicant's representative could not suggest where in the specification there was support for the argued interpretation of the claim limitations.